

Second, I have provided herewith the front page of PCT application PCT/US01/28675 showing that the PCT application claims priority from the above referenced US case. Also provided is the PCT Preliminary Examination Report (dated July 1, 2002) issued by the US PTO indicating that claims 1-30 have novelty (i.e., are not anticipated) and inventive step (i.e., are non-obvious) over the recited prior art. (Claims 31-48 were not in the PCT case.) This report was prepared by **Ex. Michael Cuff** at the US PTO. That is, the US PTO has already examined all claims (both system and method) and determined that claims 1-30 are allowable over the prior art.

Third, in view of the already performed examination of both the system and method, no further burden would be placed upon the U.S. Patent Office to provide an action with respect to all claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to

call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Jacobson  
Reg. No. 39,235  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.  
65 Woods End Road  
Stamford, CT 06905  
(203) 329-1160

August 13, 2002